

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

MICHEALA MICHELLE LUDWICK,

Plaintiff,

v.

CLINTON, COUNTY OF, et al.,

Defendant.

Case No. 1:25-cv-320

HON. JANE M. BECKERING

_____ /

MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER

Plaintiff filed her Complaint in this matter on March 23, 2025, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983, alleging claims arising out of events that occurred during her 30-day incarceration at the Clinton County Jail (ECF No. 1). Plaintiff also moved for leave to proceed under a pseudonym (ECF No. 2). On April 17, 2025, the Magistrate Judge denied Plaintiff's motion for leave to proceed under a pseudonym and ordered her to file a notice containing her true name and to file corrected proposed summonses within 14 days of the date of the order. (ECF No. 7). On May 19, 2025, having received no notice or corrected proposed summonses, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 9 ("R&R")), recommending that this matter be dismissed for want of prosecution and failure to comply with the rules and orders of this Court. *See* FED. R. CIV. P. 41(b); W.D. Mich. LCivR 41.1. The Magistrate Judge stated that Plaintiff's "timely objections" to the R&R "shall be considered Plaintiff's opportunity to show cause why this matter should not be dismissed" (ECF No. 9 at PageID.43).

On May 21, 2025, Plaintiff filed a response in opposition (ECF No. 10) to the R&R. Plaintiff argues that “Plaintiff’s counsel needed additional time to verify with Plaintiff her intention and understanding” regarding the disclosure of her true name (ECF No. 10 at PageID.46). Plaintiff also represents “significant national media attention [] had to be monitored for privacy and safety reasons” (*id.*). Plaintiff also represents that she has filed a companion case and, in that case, she was also required to disclose her true name and has done so “after a lull in attention” (*id.*). Alongside Plaintiff’s response to the R&R, Plaintiff filed a Notice of Plaintiff’s true name (ECF No. 11) and corrected proposed summonses (ECF No. 12).

The Court concludes that Plaintiff has made a minimally sufficient showing of cause and appears to now be in compliance with applicable rules and orders of this Court. Therefore:

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge (ECF No. 9) is DISMISSED AS MOOT.

Dated: June 2, 2025

/s/ Jane M. Beckering
JANE M. BECKERING
United States District Judge

